

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

MATTHEW G. SILVA,

Plaintiff,

v.

CHRISTINE GREGOIRE, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. C05-5731 RJB/KLS

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF  
TIME TO COMPLETE DISCOVERY

This civil rights action has been referred to United States Magistrate Judge Karen L. Strombom pursuant to Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local MJR 3 and 4. Before the Court is Plaintiff's motion for extension of time to complete discovery. (Dkt. # 77). For the reasons stated below, the Court finds that the motion should be denied.

The Court originally set the discovery deadline for August 25, 2006. (Dkt. # 33). The parties agreed to extend the discovery deadline to October 27, 2006 (Dkt. # 63), "to permit depositions to be taken and to finish exchanging discovery documents." (Dkt. # 59). The parties advised the Court that the purpose of the extension was to allow scheduled depositions to take place and to allow the parties to complete the exchange of documents. (*Id.*). Plaintiff took the depositions of Defendants Porter, Wentland and Coppola. (Dkt. # 80, Exh. 1). The parties have had

1 approximately ten months to complete discovery.

2 Plaintiff provides no good faith reason for yet another extension of the discovery deadline. In  
3 the declaration attached to his motion, Plaintiff complains of the receipt of discovery which was  
4 delayed by two weeks, discovery made the subject of a motion to compel which has been addressed  
5 by the Court (Dkt. # 86), and the refusal of defense counsel to accept service of deposition  
6 subpoenas for non-party witnesses. Defendant also refers to testimony needed from proposed  
7 defendants named in his proposed second amended complaint, although leave to amend the  
8 complaint has now been denied. Leave to amend was denied as Plaintiff failed to provide the Court  
9 with a basis for adding seventeen additional defendants and seven new claims. The Court found that  
10 the proposed amendment would require reopening discovery, causing undue prejudice and delay.  
11 (Dkt. # 85). Plaintiff's action was filed almost one year ago and the parties have already engaged in  
12 a substantial amount of discovery. The discovery deadline, which was extended until October 27,  
13 2006, is now long passed.

14 The parties have had ten months to complete discovery. There is no good cause to grant yet  
15 another extension of discovery in this case. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion (Dkt. # 77) is **DENIED**.

16 The Clerk is directed to send copies of this Order to Plaintiff and counsel for Defendants.  
17

18 DATED this 7th day of December, 2006.  
19  
20

21   
22 Karen L. Strombom  
23 United States Magistrate Judge  
24  
25  
26